

## Eastern Illinois University The Keep

---

Masters Theses

Student Theses & Publications

---

1987

# Educational Leadership: A Study of Graduates of Eastern Illinois University's Educational Administration Program

Elizabeth L. Smith

*Eastern Illinois University*

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Educational Administration](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

---

### Recommended Citation

Smith, Elizabeth L., "Educational Leadership: A Study of Graduates of Eastern Illinois University's Educational Administration Program" (1987). *Masters Theses*. 2601.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2601>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP: A STUDY OF  
GRADUATES OF EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY'S  
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

---

(TITLE)

BY  
ELIZABETH L. SMITH

FIELD STUDY  
~~THESIS~~

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF

SPECIALIST IN EDUCATION

---

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1987

---

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING  
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

# THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

Date

Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

Author

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to investigate the perceptions of graduates from Eastern Illinois University's Educational Administration program as to how effective their preparation was in preparing them for the role as instructional/educational leader.

A survey was developed and distributed to 214 Educational Administration students who graduated between 1982 and 1986. The data collected was broken down into three different categories to study: Female and Male Graduates, Teacher and Administrative Graduates and Graduates before 1983 and after 1985. A response rate of 42% was obtained.

An independent t test was utilized to compare the mean scores for the Foundations and Required courses for M.S. in Education for each of the three sub groups studied. It was found that:

1. Foundations courses were not perceived as useful for preparing administrators for the role of educational leadership.

2. EDA 5410, School Law, EDA 5870, Personnel Administration and EDA 5640, Administration and Supervision of the Secondary School were rated the most useful in preparing administrators for their role as educational leaders.

3. EDA 5900, Introduction to Research, was considered the least useful in preparing administrators for educational leadership, but still considered a useful course.

4. While no females are members of the Department of Educational Administration, no significant differences could be noted that might indicate a difference in female's perceptions of the program. In some cases, the female graduates rated courses higher than their male counterparts.

5. Staff changes in the department have not altered the perceptions of graduates of the program.

6. Perceptions of teachers who have had little or no experience as administrative instructional leaders did not view the program differently than administrators who were currently dealing with educational leadership issues and House Bill 730 as it affects the administrator's role.

### DEDICATION

This is dedicated to Lee F. Stofferahn,  
my teacher, my counselor, my friend,  
and my father.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES IN CHAPTER IV.....	ii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Overview of the Problem.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Limitations of the Study.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	5
II. RATIONALE, RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH	7
Review of Literature and Research.....	8
Uniqueness of the Study.....	13
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY.....	15
General Design of the Study.....	15
Sample and Population.....	16
Data Collection and Instrumentation.....	17
Data Analysis.....	17
IV. RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENTATIONS	19
Male-Female Perceptions.....	21
Perceptions of Graduates before 1983	
-after 1985.....	24
Teacher-Administrator Perceptions.....	28
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND	
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	33
Summary.....	33
Findings.....	33
Conclusions.....	33
Recommendations.....	35
APPENDICES.....	41
FOOTNOTES.....	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	40

# LIST OF TABLES IN CHAPTER IV

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Perceptions of EIU Educational Administration Program Based on 61 Male Respondents.....	19
2.	Perceptions of EIU Educational Administration Program Based on 28 Female Respondents....	20
3.	Graduates Before 1983 Perceptions of the Educational Administration Program Based on 29 Respondents.....	22
4.	Graduates After 1985 Perceptions of the Educational Administration Program Based on 44 Respondents.....	23
5.	Perceptions of Educational Administration Program Based on 36 Teacher Respondents...	26
6.	Perceptions of Educational Administration Program Based on 48 Administrator Respondnets	27



## INTRODUCTION

### OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

A "Nation At Risk", published almost four years ago, served as the birth of the current education reform movement in the United States. This report, along with thirty other major reform reports<sup>1</sup>, all agreed that education in our public schools, colleges and universities fell short of providing our students with "excellence in education". SAT scores had consistently declined since 1963, business and industry complained that even college graduates were ill equipped to function in the work setting, and illiteracy rates among adults were still at an alarmingly high rate.

These and other problems spurred legislatures to begin looking closely at educational issues in their states. The results across the country were sweeping and sometimes drastic reform packages that were enacted after 1984. From the loss of tenure for teachers in New Mexico, to teacher testing in Florida, Mississippi and Arkansas to student competency testing and teacher evaluations and ratings, most states were trying to improve education and the way in which educators would be accountable for its delivery. (Information obtained by writer in conversations with fellow educators while attending the National Education Association

Representative Assembly in Louisville, Kentucky, July, 1986.)

In trying to improve education in our schools, another "buzz" word has become common among educators - "effective". How can we have "effective" schools? "Effective" teachers? "Effective" principals?

In looking at the research on effectiveness, test scores of students are only one of the measures utilized to determine whether or not a school/teacher is effective. The whole climate, environment and style is studied. It has been determined that well educated staff members alone do not guarantee an "effective" school.

Effective school research points to several characteristics of schools which are considered to be effective for all their students. They are:

1. A Sense of Mission: A conscious collegial decision to become effective and to assure minimum mastery of basic school skills for all pupils.

2. Strong Building Leadership: A principal, the instructional leader, who is bold, supportive and dedicated to the mission of the school. They are also active and involved with all parts of the educational community.

3. High Expectations for all Students and Staff:  
Effective schools expect teachers to teach and students to learn. Standards are high yet realistic.

4. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress:  
Effective schools have teachers and pupils who are constantly aware of pupil progress in relation to instructional objectives.

5. A Positive Learning Environment: Effective schools are orderly, quiet, and conducive to learning while still maintaining a warm and caring atmosphere.

6. Sufficient Opportunity for Learning:  
Effective schools emphasize "time on task".

7. Parent/Community Involvement: Effective schools have broad support by parents and community.

Effective school research identifies strong building leadership as a key in creating the instructionally effective school.<sup>2</sup> Reform packages in several states have included sections on improving administrative leadership skills.

In 1985, the Illinois legislature passed and implemented our current state reform package which mandated that administrators be trained in evaluation techniques, be certified every five years, and spend at least 51% of their day as the instructional leader in their building.

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In reviewing the HB730 legislation affecting administrators and educational leadership, the writer questioned how effective was the Educational Administration program at Eastern Illinois University in preparing its graduates to be instructional leaders? How did the graduates perceive their training?

In finding an answer to the above the writer choose to further stratify the information obtained by surveying graduates of the program into three different categories.

1. Perceptions of graduates before 1983 as compared to graduates after 1985. Since the Educational Administration department has had a significant change in staff, it was felt that the perceptions of these two groups should be compared and differences noted.

2. Perceptions of female graduates as compared to male graduates. As no females are members of the Educational Administration department, the writer questioned whether or not females' perceptions of their training would differ significantly from male graduates.

3. Perceptions of practicing administrators as compared to practicing teachers. Would the difference

in actual implementation versus theory show differences in their perceptions of the program?

#### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

To find the answer to the above questions the writer developed and distributed a survey to the Educational Administration graduates. (See Appendix I) Three limitations of this study must be noted.

1. Only graduates of Educational Administration were sent this survey (214 total). Educators who have gone through this program and gained administrative certification without obtaining a Masters in Administration were not included.

2. Only Educational Administration students who graduated during the past five years (1982-85) were included in this survey.

3. In sending out surveys to all 214 graduates the randomness of this sample can be questioned. Since only 89 graduates responded, or 42%, the writer would question whether this sample would accurately reflect the perceptions of all the Educational Administration program participants?

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the sake of convenience and clarity, let it be known that the terms educational leadership and instructional leadership are synonymous.

Effectiveness, in educational terms for principals, is defined by the writer as the level of ability to positively influence staff, students and community groups, to identify needs, establish high expectations and develop, execute and evaluate programs to improve school achievement.

Educational Administration Graduates are students who have completed the required coursework in Educational Administration courses and Educational Foundations courses to receive a Master's in Education and be certified as a Building Principal in the State of Illinois.

## CHAPTER II

### RATIONALE, RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

#### RATIONALE

"The Carnegie Report" in referring to continuing education states, "Compensation should be based on proven competence, not time in the chair."<sup>3</sup>

In reviewing the program offered by the Educational Administration department, the writer questioned whether or not graduates found the program useful in preparing them for instructional leadership or simply satisfied "time in the chair". Having been a graduate student herself in the department, the writer wanted a more meaningful standard by which to judge the effectiveness of the program. Was it serving the need of administrative candidates in the East Central Illinois area?

By surveying past graduates, the writer hoped to obtain a clearer picture of the perceptions of the graduates and to draw conclusions about the Educational Administration program's effectiveness.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Two surveys developed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals; "State Certification Requirements for the Secondary Principalship" (1977) and "A Survey of Preservice Preparation Programs for Secondary School Principals" (1978) document that "preparation programs (for principals) are essentially diverse collections of formal courses that, taken together, do not reveal consistent purposes or a systematic design."<sup>4</sup> Another report, by the National Association of Elementary School Principals states, "Most preparation programs do a good job of providing an adequate knowledge base. They too often fall short, however, in translating such knowledge into practical application at the elementary/middle school level."<sup>5</sup>

What then must be done to ensure that our administrative preparation programs prepare administrative candidates for the role as instructional leader? According to the report by the National Association of Elementary School Principals, four major proficiency areas are needed in a preparation program to develop outstanding instructional leaders. They are: Experience and Education, Leadership Proficiencies, Supervisory Proficiencies and Administrative Proficiencies.<sup>6</sup> These same areas are



the identified characteristics used to describe an effective instructional leader in the literature reviewed. The writer has used the monograph published by the Illinois State Board of Education for the Illinois Administrator's Academy as a basis for comparing current research on instructional leadership. In the monograph The Principal As Instructional Leader, the Illinois State Board has attempted to synthesize the current research and develop their definition of instructional leadership. Three main areas are defined which will be discussed below.

1. Define the Mission: "Instructionally effective schools have a clearly defined mission, improving student achievement."<sup>7</sup> In interviews with principals in a University of Texas study on effective characteristics of principals by William L. Rutherford, when asked about their visions, effective principals did not hesitate to list their goals for their schools. Their goals focused on students and achievement. Less effective principals in the same study, gave answers that supported maintaining status quo and focused on the present. Their goals, if any, were superficial or ones that reflected only the mandates of the the board.<sup>8</sup>

David C. Dwyer adds, in his writings, that not only do effective principals set goals based on student

achievement, but they go beyond that to tailor the goals to their specific building and community settings.<sup>9</sup>

Communication is important. Effective principals take steps to spell out their goals and visions to their colleagues clearly. Teachers understand their principal's visions and can explain them in their own words.<sup>10</sup> Effective principals communicate with community members and understand the importance of the school becoming an integral part of the neighborhood. Effective principals develop networks of supporters throughout the community to back the school and support its visions and goals.<sup>11</sup>

The development of goals is considered an important collegial process involving the principal, his staff and the community. Instructional strategies are also developed in the same manner to support the established goals.<sup>12</sup>

Besides communicating his/her goals, the effective principal is highly visible. He/she visits classrooms, spends time with students and presides over ceremonies and rituals.<sup>13</sup> In the Texas study, effective principals demonstrated the above characteristics while less effective principals were more concerned with managerial problems than educational concerns. Teachers under the direction of an effective principal

felt that their principals cared about them because they really understood what was happening in the classrooms. These effective principals also offered praise and support to their staff which also served as motivation for the staff to strive to keep improving.<sup>14</sup>

In summary of this first area, effective principals tend to establish clear goals with input from their staff, communicate clearly to a wide variety of groups and are highly visible to students, staff, parents and community members.

2. Manages Curriculum and Instruction: "The effective principal has sufficient knowledge of instructional methods to make valid and useful critiques of teacher performance."<sup>15</sup> The effective principal coordinates the instructional program. He/she has a working knowledge of curriculum materials and takes an active responsibility for overseeing the selection of the proper materials. He/she also understands the importance of learning styles and instructional techniques and how they effect learning of different students.<sup>16</sup> Evaluation in an effective school setting is an on-going process. Teachers and principal openly discuss, analyze and evaluate teaching practices. In this open style, collegiality and professionalism is nurtured and an approved practice.

The whole goal of evaluation is to improve instruction, which in turn, is to improve achievement.<sup>17</sup>

Less effective principals, as Rutherford's study in Texas indicates, make only the mandatory classroom observations and evaluations. They have little knowledge of educational strategies and evaluate in a superficial manner.<sup>18</sup>

Effective principals, according to the State Board monograph, monitor student progress. They understand tests and measurement and use the information to evaluate the instructional program. They are actively involved in interpreting test data and identifying students who may need enrichment or remediation. In the process of evaluating student data, they also pay attention to putting the right teacher with the right students to insure optimum learning.<sup>19</sup>

In summary of the second area, the effective principal takes an active role in his/her school. The day of the principal perceived as office manager and figurehead are no longer appropriate. He/she is aware of methods and techniques to improve instruction, aware of current trends and research in educational areas, understands and uses assessment instruments and evaluates staff in a formative manner to improve student achievement and performance.

3. Promotes School Climate: The effective principal plays a key role in establishing a climate in which effective instruction can take place. By reinforcing high expectations for academic standards, establishing student incentives for achievement and developing guidelines for school rules and policies, the principal helps create and nurture an environment conducive to learning.<sup>20</sup> Instructional time is guarded and interruptions are few. "Time on task" is considered a high priority and encourages his/her staff to fully utilize the entire class period for instruction and practice.<sup>21</sup>

An effective principal also chooses school inservice activities consistent with the school's goals and insures that the inservicing does not interfere with the instructional day.<sup>22</sup>

In summary of the third section, the effective principal works hard to create an environment conducive to learning and the school's established goals.

#### UNIQUENESS OF THE STUDY

It is hoped that this study will serve as a catalyst to affect needed changes in the Educational Administration program offered at Eastern Illinois University that will make Administrative graduates stronger and more knowledgeable as educational leaders.

It is also hoped that this study will provide additional feedback to Educational Administration staff members as to how effective their courses are in preparing graduate students as instructional leaders.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN OF THE STUDY

#### GENERAL DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In order to answer the questions concerning perceptions of the educational program's course of study and instructional leadership preparation, it was decided to utilize a field study design in the form of a survey by mail. No manipulation of the independent variables would take place because all data would be collected after the fact. The writer choose to also stratify the sample in order to look closer at responses by gender differences, graduation date and current profession.

The actual survey (see Appendix I) was in a simple multiple choice format for the first section that was used to gather information to stratify the study and to gain information about the makeup of the responding group. The second section was basically a rating format which asked the graduates to rate the various courses offered by the Educational Administration Department. It was hoped that the survey would be short enough to encourage the graduates

to respond and long enough to gain the needed information.

Because the survey asked the graduates to rate the different courses in the department, no identifying information was required. The writer hoped that the anonymity of the survey would also encourage graduates to respond.

#### SAMPLE AND POPULATION

A total of 214 surveys were sent to the 1982 through 1986 graduates of the Educational Administration program. Of the 214 surveys, 89 or 42% were returned. Of the surveys returned 28 or 31% were female, 61 or 69% were male. Of the respondents, 36 or 40% were practicing teachers, 48 or 54% were administrators and 5 or 6% were employed in other types of occupations not categorized as teachers or administrators. In looking at the year of graduation from the program, 29 or 33% graduated before 1983 and 44 or 49% graduated after 1985. The writer choose to look specifically at graduates before 1983 and after 1985 because the Eastern Illinois Administration staff had gone through a change in personnel which might affect the responses of the graduates who had experienced specific courses under different instructors.



The writer would again caution the reader that the representativeness of the responses could be questioned because all 214 graduates were sent the survey and only 89 replied.

#### DATA COLLECTION AND INSTRUMENTATION

The survey used by the writer for this study was developed following the format used by the Educational Administration Department in 1985 for the "1985 Annual Report, Education Administration Programs and Services, Eastern Illinois University"<sup>3</sup>. No data was available to test the reliability or validity of this type of survey.

Respondents were asked to rate each course numerically from one to six. The ratings were: "1"- Very Valuable, "2"- Valuable, "3"- Some Value, "4"- Limited Value, "5"- Very Little Value, and "6"- Not taken at EIU.

#### DATA ANALYSIS

In looking at the data obtained from the surveys, it was decided that a mean score for each course would be utilized to compare the data. A low mean score would indicate a higher perception of usefulness and value for the course in question. An Independent t test would also be used to compare the Foundations and Required course sections for each identified group. It

was also decided to include the actual percentages for the course ratings.

In looking at the actual totals for each section of Part II of the survey, too few respondents had actually taken courses required for the Specialist degree to draw conclusions. Because of the low totals in this category, it was decided to only look at the data collected for the required courses for the Masters level and Foundations programs.

To draw conclusions, the writer only utilized the mean scores for the above two sections and compared these scores in the different categories. The Independent t test was also used to statistically determine if any real differences in ratings were evident between male and female respondents, teacher and administrator respondents and graduates before 1983 and after 1985 respondents.

# CHAPTER IV

## RESULTS

TABLE 1

### PERCEPTIONS OF EIU EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM BASED ON 61 MALE RESPONDENTS

#### FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION - GROUP I COURSES

	MEAN SCORES	PERCENTAGES					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
EDF 5500	2.8	9.8	24.5	32.7	8.2	11.4	6.6
EDP 5520	3.10	4.9	22.9	37.7	13.1	14.8	8.2
EDF 5510	3.65	4.9	8.2	11.3	19.6	22.9	18.0
EDF 5530	3.65	4.9	6.5	13.1	11.4	21.3	27.9
EDF 5540	3.88	0	1.6	11.4	3.3	13.1	47.4

Group I Total Mean Score = 3.42 t = .3 t value at .05 = 2.306

#### REQUIRED COURSES FOR M.S. IN EDUCATION

EDA 5410	1.66	52.4	21.3	6.6	3.3	3.3	8.2
EDA 5420	2.0	43.4	29.5	22.9	3.3	1.6	4.9
EDA 5600	2.01	24.6	40.9	21.3	0	1.6	6.6
EDA 5630	2.25	9.8	14.8	18.0	1.6	0	36.1
EDA 5640	2.97	24.6	24.6	11.4	3.3	0	24.6
EDA 5700	2.10	22.9	36.1	29.5	1.6	0	4.9
EDA 5870	2.09	24.6	31.1	22.9	4.9	0	8.2
EDA 5900	3.02	11.4	16.3	24.6	18.0	11.4	11.4
EDA 5960	2.96	4.9	9.8	13.1	8.2	4.9	44.3

Group II Total Mean Score = 2.34 t = .678 t value at .05 = 2.120

TABLE 2

PERCEPTIONS OF EIU EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM  
 BASED ON 28 FEMALE RESPONDENTS

FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION - GROUP I COURSES		PERCENTAGES						
	MEAN SCORES	1	2	3	4	5	6	
EDF 5500	2.82	10.7	39.3	21.4	14.2	14.2	0	
EDP 5520	2.8	17.9	28.6	17.6	10.7	21.4	13.6	
EDF 5510	3.5	7.1	17.9	14.3	7.1	32.1	25.0	
EDF 5530	3.8	10.7	7.1	3.6	17.9	35.7	17.9	
EDF 5540	3.75	3.6	3.6	10.7	7.1	17.9	46.4	
Group I Total Mean Score = 3.3    t = .3    t value at .05 = 2.306								

## REQUIRED COURSES FOR M.S. IN EDUCATION

EDA 5410	1.35	75.0	17.9	3.6	3.6	0	0	
EDA 5420	2.28	25.0	39.3	21.4	10.7	3.6	0	
EDA 5600	2.25	25.0	32.7	25.0	14.3	0	0	
EDA 5630	2.43	7.1	25.0	21.4	0	3.6	28.6	
EDA 5640	2.05	21.4	25.0	10.7	7.1	0	21.4	
EDA 5700	2.60	17.9	35.7	25.0	10.7	10.7	0	
EDA 5870	1.92	42.9	21.4	21.4	7.1	0	7.1	
EDA 5900	2.66	17.9	21.4	25.0	14.3	7.1	10.7	
EDA 5960	2.22	17.9	21.4	17.9	7.1	0	32.1	
Group II Total Mean Score = 2.19    t = .678    t value at .05 = 2.120								

In comparing data for Group I, Foundations courses, both groups data were similar. The total mean score for males (Table 1) was 3.42 and females (Table 2) was 3.3 which places the ratings for these courses in the "Some Value" to "Limited Value" range.

In comparing the data of male's and female's perceptions of the program, no significant differences were noted utilizing the independent t test. ( $t=.678$ ,  $t$  value at .05 level = 2.120) In comparing the total Group II mean scores, females rated the program slightly higher than their male counterparts, 2.19 as compared to 2.34.

The course rated highest by both males and females as perceived as being most useful for educational leadership was EDA 5410, School Law (males, 1.66 - females, 1.35). The course perceived least useful in educational leadership by both males and females was EDA 5900, Introduction to Research (males, 3.02 - females, 2.66). Even though EDA 5900 was rated lowest by these two groups the rating was "Valuable to Some Value".

TABLE 3

GRADUATE'S BEFORE 1983 PERCEPTIONS OF THE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM BASED ON 29 RESPONDENTS								
FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION - GROUP I COURSES		PERCENTAGES						
	MEAN SCORES	1	2	3	4	5	6	
EDF 5500	2.6	3.4	41.4	31.0	6.9	3.4	3.4	
EDP 5520	3.04	6.9	17.2	34.5	6.9	13.8	10.3	
EDF 5510	3.28	10.3	6.9	24.1	13.8	17.2	17.2	
EDF 5530	3.56	6.9	3.4	13.8	13.8	17.2	24.1	
EDF 5540	3.3	3.4	3.4	13.8	6.9	6.9	62.1	
Group I Total Mean Score 3.15 t = 2.064 t value at .05 = 2.306								

## REQUIRED COURSES FOR M.S. IN EDUCATION

EDA 5410	1.95	41.4	20.7	10.3	3.4	6.9	6.9
EDA 5420	2.16	24.1	34.5	13.8	6.9	3.4	3.4
EDA 5600	2.16	20.7	31.0	27.6	3.4	0	6.9
EDA 5630	2.5	0	20.7	10.3	3.4	0	34.5
EDA 5640	1.91	31.0	31.0	10.3	6.9	0	6.9
EDA 5700	2.32	13.8	34.5	34.5	3.4	0	3.4
EDA 5870	2.34	20.7	17.2	34.5	6.9	0	3.4
EDA 5900	3.0	6.9	20.7	17.2	13.8	10.3	13.8
EDA 5960	2.2	3.4	6.9	6.9	0	0	62.1
Group II Total Mean Score 2.28 t = .25 t value at .05 = 2.120							

TABLE 4

GRADUATE'S AFTER 1985 PERCEPTIONS OF THE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM BASED ON 44 RESPONDENTS								
FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION - GROUP I COURSES		PERCENTAGES						
	MEAN SCORES	1	2	3	4	5	6	
EDF 5500	3.0	11.4	25.0	22.7	6.8	20.5	6.8	
EDP 5520	3.36	6.8	15.9	29.5	18.2	22.7	4.5	
EDF 5510	3.96	0	13.6	9.1	13.6	34.1	27.3	
EDF 5530	4.56	2.3	4.5	6.8	6.8	36.4	25.0	
EDF 5540	4.41	0	2.3	4.5	0	20.5	52.3	
Group I Total Mean Score 3.86 t = 2.064 t value at .05 = 2.306								

## REQUIRED COURSES FOR M.S. IN EDUCATION

EDA 5410	1.29	72.7	15.9	2.3	2.3	0	6.8	
EDA 5420	2.18	31.8	29.5	29.5	6.8	2.3	4.5	
EDA 5600	2.12	25.0	43.2	15.9	6.8	2.3	6.8	
EDA 5630	2.37	9.1	20.5	22.7	0	2.3	34.1	
EDA 5640	2.0	15.9	20.5	11.4	2.3	0	38.6	
EDA 5700	2.47	18.2	34.1	29.5	6.8	6.8	6.8	
EDA 5870	1.92	36.4	29.5	15.9	6.8	0	11.4	
EDA 5900	3.0	11.4	18.2	31.8	18.2	11.4	9.0	
EDA 5960	2.80	13.6	13.6	22.7	13.6	6.8	27.3	
Group II Total Mean Score 2.23 t = .25 t value at .05 = 2.120								

In comparing total mean scores of graduates before 1983 (Table 3) to total mean scores of graduates after 1985 (Table 4), both groups rated Group I, Foundations courses in the "Some Value" to "Limited Value" range (1983, 3.15 - 1985, 3.86). In analyzing data with the independent t test, no significant differences were noted for Foundations courses. ( $t = 2.064$ ,  $t$  value at  $.05 = 2.306$ )

Total mean scores of graduates before 1983 and graduates after 1985 were similar. (1983, 2.28 - 1985, 2.23) for courses required for M.S. in Education. Again, the independent t test revealed no significant differences in scores for either group. ( $t = .25$ ,  $t$  value at  $.05 = 2.120$ )

Courses perceived as most useful by mean scores for graduates before 1983 were EDA 5640, Administration and Supervision of the Secondary Schools, 1.91 and EDA 5410, School Law, 1.95. Both were rated in the "Very Valuable" to "Valuable" range.

Graduates after 1985 perception's of usefulness of courses for educational leadership rated EDA 5410, School Law, 1.29 and EDA 5410, Personnel Administration, 1.92 in the "Very Valuable" to "Valuable" range.



Both groups rated EDA 5900, Introduction to Research at the 3.0 range or "Some Value" level.

TABLE 5

PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM BASED ON 36 TEACHER RESPONDENTS								
FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION - GROUP I COURSES								
	MEAN SCORES	PERCENTAGES						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
EDF 5500	2.66	22.2	19.4	38.9	8.3	11.1	2.8	
EDP 5520	2.62	13.8	27.8	30.6	16.6	8.3	2.8	
EDF 5510	3.43	8.3	11.1	22.2	19.4	27.7	13.8	
EDF 5530	3.76	5.6	5.6	11.1	19.4	27.7	19.4	
EDF 5540	4.18	0	0	16.6	2.8	25.0	36.1	
Group I Total Mean Score 3.33 t = .520 t value at .05 = 2.306								
REQUIRED COURSES FOR M.S. IN EDUCATION								
EDA 5410	1.36	69.4	25.0	5.6	0	0	0	
EDA 5420	2.05	41.7	27.7	22.2	8.3	2.8	0	
EDA 5600	2.10	30.6	41.7	25.0	8.3	0	0	
EDA 5630	2.3	11.1	16.6	27.7	0	0	22.2	
EDA 5640	1.90	27.7	16.6	11.1	5.6	0	22.2	
EDA 5700	2.35	25.0	30.6	36.1	8.3	2.8	2.8	
EDA 5870	2.05	36.1	25.0	25.0	8.3	0	8.3	
EDA 5900	3.08	8.3	22.2	30.6	19.4	13.8	5.6	
EDA 5960	2.86	2.8	19.4	27.7	11.1	2.8	30.6	
Group II Total Mean Score 2.22 t = .102 t value at .05 = 2.120								

TABLE 6

PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM  
BASED ON 48 ADMINISTRATOR RESPONDENTS

FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION - GROUP I				COURSES					
	MEAN			PERCENTAGES					
	SCORES			1	2	3	4	5	6
EDF 5500	3.04			2.1	37.5	22.9	12.5	16.6	6.3
EDP 5520	3.33			4.2	16.6	33.3	12.5	20.8	8.3
EDF 5510	3.80			4.2	8.3	10.4	14.5	27.0	22.9
EDF 5530	3.88			4.2	6.3	8.3	8.3	27.0	31.3
EDF 5540	3.5			2.1	4.2	8.3	6.3	8.3	56.3
Group I Total Mean Score		3.51	t = .520	t value at .05 = 2.306					
REQUIRED COURSES FOR M.S. IN EDUCATION									
EDA 5410	1.63			54.1	18.7	6.3	2.1	4.2	10.4
EDA 5420	2.16			20.8	27.5	25.0	2.1	2.1	4.2
EDA 5600	2.24			18.8	35.4	25.0	4.2	2.1	10.4
EDA 5630	2.33			10.4	12.5	18.7	0	2.1	43.8
EDA 5640	2.17			16.6	35.4	14.5	4.2	2.1	22.9
EDA 5700	2.15			18.8	27.5	20.8	2.1	2.1	12.5
EDA 5870	2.05			22.9	33.3	18.8	4.2	0	2.1
EDA 5900	2.77			12.5	20.8	22.9	8.3	10.4	18.6
EDA 5960	2.3			14.5	12.5	6.3	4.2	4.2	43.8
Group II Total Mean Score		2.2	t = .102	t value at .05 = 2.120					

In comparing total mean scores of administrators and teachers, both groups rated Group I, Foundations courses in the "Some Value" to "Limited Value" range. Total mean scores were Teachers, 3.33 (Table 5) and Administrators, 3.51 (Table 6). No significant differences were noted in the independent t test. ( $t = .520$ ,  $t$  value at  $.05 = 2.306$ )

Teacher's and administrator's total mean scores for Group II required M.S. in Education courses were identical, 2.2 or the "Valuable" range.

The independent t test analysis for the Required courses found no significant differences in responses by either group. ( $t = .102$ ,  $t$  value at  $.05 = 2.120$ )

Administrator's mean score perceptions of courses rated EDA 5410, School Law at 1.63 and EDA 5870, Personnel Administration at 2.05.

Teacher's total mean score perceptions rated EDA 5410, School Law at 1.36 and EDA 5640, Administration and Supervision of the Secondary School at 1.90.

Both groups perceptions of usefulness to educational leadership rated EDA 5900, Introduction to Research the least useful (administrators, 2.77 - teachers, 3.08) which places this course in the "Valuable" to "Some Value" range.

Three questions which were included in Part I of the survey were used by the writer to further gain information about the usefulness of the Educational Administration program. The questions were:

1. What features of the EIU Educational Administration Program(s) have you found useful in your role as an educational leader?

2. What features of the EIU Educational Administration Program(s) have you found least useful in your role as an educational leader?

3. What changes would you suggest to improve the EIU Educational Administration Program(s) to meet the needs of educational leadership?

Many of the eighty nine respondents felt that specific courses were the best features of the department. Specific courses that were mentioned more frequently than others were: School Law, School Finance, School-Community Relations, Personnel Administration: Teacher-Administrator Relationships and Administration and Supervision of the Secondary/Elementary Schools.

Other respondents focused on the staff and program as a whole. One respondent stated, "I have found that in general, the program is excellent. Administrators who have degrees from some other institutions have not shown near the quality leadership that EIU grads have

shown." Another feature stated by a graduate, "Excellent professors who know what they're talking about and have been administrators themselves." Still another replied, "Availability of the instructors and the interest the instructors have in each student."

Many of the eighty nine respondents felt that the Foundations courses were not useful for educational leadership. As one respondent wrote, "The curriculums in the foundations area were the weakest and least value to me as an administrator. All text - very little content." Another respondent stated, "I found the Foundations courses the least useful. If an individual had been in a school, these courses were a repeat of knowledge already gained." Another responded, "Educational Philosophy! What a waste of valuable time."

Several respondents offered suggestions for improving the Foundations courses with more practical information on teacher evaluation, "real" curriculum development and evaluation and effective teaching/schools research.

Other graduates suggested that the Foundations courses be replaced with other courses more useful and practical. Suggestions included, courses in special education, additional law courses, a course that would teach decision making skills and stress management.

Another suggestion that was made repeatedly by graduates was to develop and offer a course on evaluation. As one respondent states, "I would like to see more time spent on proper evaluation of staff (which would also cover proper methods of helping staff members become better teachers)." Another responded, "Focus on Evaluation - practice perhaps on video tapes - practice these techniques 'Role play' with a teacher who needs remediation." A third stated, "More specific training related to latest school effectiveness research, effective teaching, more specific training on being an instructional leader."

Many respondents suggested more "hands on" experiences. As one respondent wrote, "Have in-class work on filling out state aid forms, voed forms, transportation forms, etc." Another voiced, "Bargain a contract. Do a real Budget. Teach people how to evaluate someone through the use of video-tapes."

Several suggested using "role playing" techniques to develop skills on evaluation, conferencing techniques and bargaining.

One further recommendation that was made repeatedly by the respondents was to limit the number of classroom reports made by students. It was felt that little information was gained by listening to students who were themselves inexperienced in the role of

administrator. Graduates wanted more time devoted to actual presentations made by administrators and presentations made by the instructor. It did not seem that the graduates wished to avoid doing reports or projects, but just requested that they not be a major portion of the class curriculum.



## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### SUMMARY

In order to ascertain the perceptions of graduates of the Educational Administration program at Eastern Illinois University as to the usefulness in preparing them for the role of educational leadership, the writer developed and distributed a survey to 1982 - 1986 graduates of the program. To look at specific segments of the sample group, the writer compared the perceptions of males and females, teachers and administrators and graduates before 1983 and graduates after 1985.

#### FINDINGS

No significant differences could be found in the mean scores of the respondents by analyzing the survey data utilizing the independent t test. All groups rated the Group I, Foundations courses in the "Some Value" to "Limited Value" range while rating the Group II, required courses for the M.S. in Education in the "Very Valuable" to "Valuable" range.

## CONCLUSIONS

In comparing and analyzing the data obtained from the surveys, the writer drew several conclusions:

1. Group I Foundations courses are not perceived as useful for preparing administrators for the role of educational leadership.

2. EDA 5410, School Law, EDA 5870, Personnel Administration and EDA 5640 Administration and Supervision of the Secondary School were rated the most useful in preparing administrators for their role as educational leaders.

3. EDA 5900, Introduction to Research, while still being rated in the "Valuable" to "Some Valuable" range, was considered the least useful in preparing administrators for educational leadership.

4. While no females are members of the Department of Educational Administration, no significant differences could be noted that might indicate a difference in female's perceptions of the program. In some cases, the female's rated courses higher than their male counterparts.

5. Staff changes in the department have not altered the perceptions of graduates of the program.

6. Perceptions of teachers who have little or no experience as administrative instructional leaders did

not view the program differently than administrators who are currently dealing with educational leadership issues and House Bill 730 as it effects the administrator's role.

7. The personal attention to graduate students by staff members is an important part of the success of the Educational Administration program.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

It would seem that the Foundations courses which are required for Master's level degrees in education should be made more relevant to the needs of the students. A suggestion, by the writer, would be to appoint an Advisory Committee composed of graduates, students and staff members of the Educational Foundations department and other graduate programs to review the current curriculum and revise, update and improve the content and course offerings. This Advisory Committee should meet on a regular basis in order to completely study the program and curriculum and compare it to other graduate programs throughout the state.

A general perusal of the opinions expressed indicates a strong desire by most graduates for practical applications and less theory. Because of the many suggestions concerned with practical applications the writer would like to suggest the

development of a practicum course or an internship program in addition to more practice included in the regular courses. The majority of educators who seek administrative degrees and positions have had little or no experience as an administrator. A practicum or internship would serve as a vehicle for potential administrators to test the waters and have the chance to discuss their concerns and correct their mistakes with practicing administrators and professors. Also, it would give the student a chance to decide whether or not the administrative role is one that he/she would really like to seek. In conversation with many administrators, the writer heard over and over again that nothing had prepared them for the actual role of administration. Association leadership, classroom leadership and other community responsibilities did little to prepare them for the day to day problems of dealing with students, parents, teachers and boards of education.

Another recommendation that the author would like to add would be for the staff members to continue to be accessible to graduate students for advisement and discussion. New administrators "on the line" do not hesitate to call and ask for help and feel comfortable discussing concerns with the current staff. This one aspect alone has helped to make the program successful

and highly rated by former students and should be encouraged and continued.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>K. Patricia Cross, "The Adventures of Education in Wonderland: Implementing Education Reform," PHI DELTA KAPPAN, (March, 1987), 496.

<sup>2</sup>John R. Farley, "Some Characteristics of Leaders of Effective Schools," American Secondary Education, (Vol.12, No. 4, 1983), incomplete cite.

<sup>3</sup>Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, (May, 1986), 77.

<sup>4</sup>National Association of Secondary School Principals Consortium for the Performance-Based Preparation of Principals, Performance-Based Preparation of Principals: A Framework for Improvement, (1985), 2.

<sup>5</sup>National Association of Elementary School Principals, Proficiencies for Principals: Kindergarten Through Eighth Grade, (1986), 1.

<sup>6</sup>National Association of Elementary School Principals, p. 1.

<sup>7</sup>Illinois State Board of Education, The Principal As Instructional Leader: A Research Synthesis, (Springfield, 1986), 2.

<sup>8</sup>William B. Rutherford, "School Principals as Effective Leaders," PHI DELTA KAPPAN, (September, 1985), 31.

<sup>9</sup>David C. Dwyer, "The Search for Instructional Leadership: Routines and Subtleties in the Principal's Role," Educational Leadership, (February, 1984) incomplete cite.

<sup>10</sup>Rutherford, p. 33.

<sup>11</sup>Dwyer, incomplete cite.

<sup>12</sup>Illinois State Board of Education, p. 2.

<sup>13</sup>Illinois State Board of Education, p. 3.

<sup>14</sup>Rutherford, p. 34.

<sup>15</sup>Illinois State Board of Education, p. 3.

<sup>16</sup>Illinois State Board of Education, p. 4.

<sup>17</sup>Judith Warren Little, "The Effective Principal," American Education, (August-September, 1982) incomplete cite.

<sup>18</sup>Rutherford, p. 34.

<sup>19</sup>Illinois State Board of Education, p. 4.

<sup>20</sup>Illinois State Board of Education, p. 5.

<sup>21</sup>Anita Sunseri, "Effective Principals as Educational Leaders," School Administrator, (September, 1981), 36.

<sup>22</sup>Sunseri, p. 37.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1986.
- Cross, K. Patricia. "The Adventures of Education in Wonderland: Implementing Education Reform," PHI DELTA KAPPAN, (March, 1987) 496-502.
- Dwyer, David C. "The Search for Instructional Leadership: Routines and Subtleties in the Principal's Role," Educational Leadership, (February, 1984), incomplete cite.
- Farley, John R. "Some Characteristics of Leaders of Effective Schools," American Secondary Education, (1983), incomplete cite.
- Illinois State Board of Education. The Principal As Instructional Leader: A Research Synthesis, 1986.
- Little, Judith Warren. "The Effective Principal," American Education, (August - September, 1982), incomplete cite.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. Proficiencies for Principals: Kindergarten Through Eighth Grade, 1986.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. Performance-Based Preparation of Principals, 1985.
- Rutherford, William B. "School Principals as Effective Leaders," PHI DELTA KAPPAN, (September, 1985), 31-34.





EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS 61920

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION  
Room 211 Buzzard Building  
Ph: (217) 581-2919  
581-2826

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM SURVEY  
1981-1986  
SPRING, 1987

PART I

1. Current Status
  - ☐ Currently employed in administration
  - ☐ Not employed in administration
2. In what year did you receive your degree?
  - ☐ 1981                      ☐ 1984
  - ☐ 1982                      ☐ 1985
  - ☐ 1983                      ☐ 1986
3. What was your exit status in Educational Administration at EIU?
  - ☐ M.S. in Educational Administration
  - ☐ Ed. Specialist
  - ☐ Certification Only
4. If you received a M.S. or Specialist in Education Degree, in what year was the degree completed?
  - ☐ 1981                      ☐ 1984
  - ☐ 1982                      ☐ 1985
  - ☐ 1983                      ☐ 1986
5. Age Group
  - ☐ Under 30
  - ☐ 30 - 40
  - ☐ 40 - 50
  - ☐ over 50
6. Sex
  - ☐ Male
  - ☐ Female
7. Present Position
  - ☐ Teacher (K-12)
  - ☐ Elementary Principal
  - ☐ Secondary Principal (Junior and/or Senior High School)
  - ☐ Central Office Administration Other Than Superintendent
  - ☐ Superintendent of Schools
  - ☐ Other (Please Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8. Current Job Site  
    ( ) Illinois  
    ( ) Other Than Illinois (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
9. Type of District and Size  
    ( ) Rural           Enrollment Size \_\_\_\_\_  
    ( ) Urban          Enrollment Size \_\_\_\_\_  
    ( ) Suburban       Enrollment Size \_\_\_\_\_
10. What features of the EIU Educational Administration Program(s)  
    have you found useful in your role as an educational leader?
11. What features of the EIU Educational Administration Program(s)  
    have you found least useful in your role as an educational leader?
12. What changes would you suggest to improve the EIU Educational  
    Administration Program(s) to meet the needs of educational  
    leadership?



EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM SURVEY  
1981-1986  
SPRING, 1987

PART II

Instructions: Please indicate the value of each course in terms of your preparation for educational leadership as defined by HB 730 by circling the appropriate number:

Very Valuable	Valuable	Some Value	Limited Value	Very Little Value	Course Not Taken At EIU
1	2	3	4	5	6

A. Group I - Foundations of Education

1. EDF 5500 - Curriculum Development	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. EDP 5520 - Understanding the Individual	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. EDF 5510 - Social Foundations of Education	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. EDF 5530 - Philosophy of Education	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. EDF 5540 - History of Educational Thought	1	2	3	4	5	6

B. Group II - Required Courses in M.S. in Education Degree Program

1. EDA 5410 - School Law	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. EDA 5420 - School-Community Relations	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. EDA 5600 - Introduction to Organization and Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. EDA 5630 - Administration and Supervision of the Elementary School	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. EDA 5640 - Administration and Supervision of the Secondary School	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. EDA 5700 - Supervision of Instruction	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. EDA 5870 - Personnel Administration: Teacher-Administrator Relationships	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. EDA 5900 - Introduction to Research in Education	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. EDA 5960 - Data Management in Educational Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6

C. Group III - Required Courses in Specialist in Education Degree Program

1. EDA 5850 - School Plant Planning	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. EDA 5860 - School Finance	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. EDA 6650 - The Superintendent of Schools	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. EDA 6700 - Planning and Evaluation of Instructional Programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. EDA 6870 - Professional Negotiations - Collective Bargaining in Education	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. EDA 6910/6920 - Field Experiences in Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6

D. Group IV - Electives in Educational Administration

1. EDA 5490 - Special Education Problems	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. EDA 5910/5920 - Internship in Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. EDA 5950 - Thesis	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. EDA 5990 - Independent Study	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. EDA 6810 - Seminar: School Operations and the Law	1	2	3	4	5	6

E. Academic Advisement

How helpful was your academic advisement?	1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comments